

a victory, because we shall have won a victory only when we shall have won peace and when the world is settled and is brought back to the principles of charity, of justice, which has been advocated for such a long time and which has not been brought back; otherwise we shall have in the very near future—I hope it will not happen, but it is bound to happen—a war which will bring about the complete annihilation of mankind. I hope that time will never arrive.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who wishes to speak, the Minister of Justice, who is the mover of this motion, will close the debate.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate I wish to take only a moment to express my great gratification to hon. members both for the high plane of humanitarian idealism, and also for the stern realism which has been manifested in most of the addresses that have been made on this resolution. Of course, divergent views as to ways and means have been expressed, but I think we will all agree that there has been no divergence on the fundamental desirability and even on the practicability of an international organization based on justice and fair dealing. Some are more optimistic than others. High idealism is bountifully expressed in the charter; but when we come to stern realities, everyone agrees that there are things in the charter which we deplore and which we hope will not remain there for all time. But if the nations are sincere—and I believe their peoples are sincere—if those who represent them will listen to what are the real feelings of the populations they represent, and for whom they claim to speak, the solemn undertakings of this charter should make for better understanding and better living conditions for mankind.

There are solemn obligations undertaken by all those who signed this charter. Of course it is true that there is the right of withdrawal as an incident of sovereignty; but those who signed the charter should, I think, realize that if they withdraw they must be prepared to say either that they have no longer faith in the remaining members of the organization or that they are so selfish as not to be prepared themselves to take their share in maintaining better conditions for all. To self-respecting nations that should be a pretty stern check on the exercise of the sovereign right of withdrawal.

The suggestion has been made that the great powers, or those called such in the enumeration of the charter, are not them-

[Mr. Puuliot]

selves assuming the obligations of the charter. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a correct view. Every signatory of the charter assumes the obligations thereof and makes a solemn pledge to refrain from the use or from the threat of the big stick, or the bigger stick, or the revolver, or the tommy-gun for any other purpose than the purposes of the organization itself; and the bigger the nation, it seems to me, the more solemn and the more impressive should be the undertaking given to the rest of the world.

There is such a thing as *noblesse oblige*; may it never be forgotten, not by the nations, not by the peoples—I am sure they will not forget—but by those who will purport to speak and to act for the nations.

In spite of the diverging views that have been expressed it is still my sincere hope that this house will unanimously approve the signature of the charter by the representatives of Canada.

Regret has been expressed that invitations were not sent to neutral countries. It would be a glorious thing if neutrality were compatible with the obligations that have to be assumed in the hope to maintain peace; but it is one of the unfortunate circumstances of human nature in these times that, to create anything on which hope can be based that peace will prevail, we have to provide an organization with teeth in it, and the teeth have to be provided by an undertaking to be made by each signatory that he will contribute forces prepared to fight, if needs be, to the extent determined under agreement entered into between him and the security council. Unfortunately that is not compatible with neutrality. A country cannot be a full member of this organization without being prepared to call upon its human and material resources to contribute to the common pool from which force may have to be drawn to compel those who otherwise would not do so to abstain from bringing about the horrors our generation has twice seen. It is to be regretted; nevertheless it is an essential requirement.

The question has been submitted as to what would be Canada's share in that force that might have to be called upon to maintain the purposes of the organization. Whatever may be Canada's share stated in the agreement between its representatives and the security council, ultimately it will have to come back to this house and the other house for ratification. Those who will represent Canada in making that agreement will have to